

United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	1
10/626,261	07/24/2003	Joel D. Oxman	56464US003	9585	
32692 3M INNOVAT	7590 04/06/200 TIVE PROPERTIES CO	EXAMINER			
PO BOX 3342	7	ROBERTS, LEZAH			
ST. PAUL, MN 55133-3427			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	1
		1614			
					_
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
	•		04/06/2007	ELECTRONIC	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

LegalUSDocketing@mmm.com LegalDocketing@mmm.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/626,261	OXMAN ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
Lezah W. Roberts	1614		

	Lezah W. Roberts	1614						
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress					
THE REPLY FILED 17 January 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.								
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a No a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance time periods:	ving replies: (1) an amendment, aff tice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in c	idavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C	nce, which FR 41.31; or (3)					
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing date of the final rejection. The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f). It is period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing date of the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).								
have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply origi than three months after the mailing da	of the fee. The approprinally set in the final Offi	iate extension fee ce action; or (2) as					
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).								
AMENDMENTS The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection.	hut prior to the data of filing a brief	will not be optored b	ecause					
 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below); (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below); 								
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or	• •	ducing or simplifying	the issues for					
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a	corresponding number of finally rei	ected claims	•					
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	corresponding number of infully for	cotog ciaimis.						
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.13	21 See attached Notice of Non-Co	mnliant Amendment	(PTOL-324)					
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)	•	·	(1 TOL 024).					
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s). 		timely filed amendme	ent canceling the					
non-allowable claim(s). 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:								
Claim(s) allowed:								
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 23,26-29,32-35,40-43,45,46 and 48-56								
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE								
8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will <u>not</u> be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).								
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).								
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.								
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER								
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u>								
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s).								
13.		Sphlas 9	all					
		Patent Exmr. P	^F . Krass rimary Exmr. U 1614					

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant argues Joshi et al. fails to disclose a thermally responsive composition including a polymerizable component. There is no disclosure in the reference that any crosslinked polymer includes unreacted crosslinking agent. This argument is not persuasive.

The pH-responsive polymers themselves are polymerizable components and can be used to make copolymers. Exemplary pH-triggered gelling polymers include those containing carboxyl groups, which comprise carboxy vinyl polymers made from monomers such as methacrylic acid and ethacrylic acid. These polymers can be used to make copolymers because they have reactive groups that can polymerize with other monomers or polymers. The compositions do not require the pH dependent polymers to be cross-linked, cross-linking is optional.

In regards to the 103 rejection over Bromberg et al., Applicant argues independent claims 23 and 29 recite applying a thermally responsive composition to hard tissue of an oral surface. Bromberg et al. does not disclose that the compositions are applied to the hard tissue of the teeth. One skilled in the art would not be motivated to modify the disclosure of Bromberg et al. to arrive at the presently claimed invention. This argument is not persuasive.

Bromberg et al. also teaches, as pointed out by Applicant, the compositions may be used for cosmetic purposes. Teeth whitening is a cosmetic application and the instant compositions may comprise whitening agents.

In regards to the 103 rejection over Bromberg et al. in view of Murray, Applicant argues claim 52 depends from claim 29. Murray fails to provide that which is missing from Bromberg et al. This argument is not persuasive.

Murray discloses the static mixer and using them are ideally suited for dispensing. In other words Murray discloses the advantage of using a static mixer to combine the components of the primary reference.